

Please amend claim 15 as follows:

15. (Amended) The white film as claimed in claim 10, wherein the titanium dioxide and the optical brightener are additionally present in the outer layer(s).

Please add new claim 16 as follows:

16. The white film as claimed in claim 1, wherein said white film further comprises regrind.

Remarks

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112. as lacking sufficient antecedent basis for the claim limitation "the outer layer(s)". Applicant has amended the claim so that it is no longer dependent from claim 14, but rather from claim 10. Sufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the outer layer(s)" can be found therein.

Claims 1-5, 7, and 9-11 stand rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,660,931 in further view of Murschall et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,900,294. In view of the amendments made to claim 1, and the comments hereto, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

As pointed out by the Examiner in the official Office Action dated April 25, 2002, the '931 patent issued to Kim et al. discloses a crystallizable thermoplastic comprised of polyethylene terephthalate. More specifically, Kim discloses in column 1 lines 61-67 a crystallizable thermoplastic comprised of a polyester/polyolefin blend. On page 3 lines 20-25 of the application as filed, Applicant states examples of crystallizable thermoplastics suitable for use in the claimed film. All examples shown there are polyesters. Applicant has amended claim 1, so as specifically exclude polyolefins from the claimed group of crystallizable thermoplastics, and has limited the claimed group to polyesters.

As to the '294 reference, Murschall discloses the use of filler particles included in the '294 film to impart whiteness and haze to the film. In column 3 lines 18-27, Murschall teaches the use of 5 to 20% fillers, and discloses the use of titanium dioxide and calcium carbonate as examples of these fillers. As disclosed by Murschall in column 4 lines 21-27, TiO_2 is combined with CaCO_3 to create a white/opaque appearance in the polyolefin film. Films containing these fillers have a hazy opaque appearance caused by scattering processes at the vacuoles of the base layer. These vacuoles are created by the inclusion of these fillers in the polymer film.

Unlike the film disclosed by Murschall, Applicant is not concerned with imparting an opaque property to the claimed film. Rather, as disclosed on page 2 lines 13-16, Applicant desires a film with a high degree of whiteness, and low yellowness index. Because TiO_2 is one of the fillers disclosed by Murschall, its incorporation would be expected to show an increase in the haze due to the vacuole formation in the film. However, as disclosed by Applicant on page 5 lines 16-17, the use of TiO_2 in the claimed polymer matrix avoids the occurrence of any vacuoles. It is both surprising and unexpected that Applicant can use the filler molecule of TiO_2 disclosed in Murschall's polyolefin film and experience little or no haze as caused by vacuole formation in the claimed polyester film. Indeed, Murschall would seem to teach away from using TiO_2 as a filler/coloring agent when opaqueness due to vacuole formation is not desired in the resulting film.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,660,931 in view of von Meer, U.S. Pat. No. 4,384,040 in further view of Murschall et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,900,294. In light of the current amendments to claim 1, and the comments hereto, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,660,931 in view of Murschall et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,900,294. In light of the current amendments to claim 1, and the comments hereto, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,660,931 in view of von Meer, U.S. Pat. No. 4,384,040 in further view of

Serial Number 09/769,619
Attorney's Docket 00/052 MFE
Art Unit 1774

Murschall et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,900,294. In light of the current amendments to claim 1, and the comments hereto, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Also attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the claims by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned "Version With Markings To Show Changes Made".

In view of the foregoing amendment and these remarks, this application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Klaus Schweitzer
(See attached Recognition Form)
ProPat L.L.C.
2912 Crosby Road
Charlotte, North Carolina 28211-2815
Telephone: (704) 365-4881
Fax: (704) 365-4851

Attorney's Docket 00/051 MFE

F:\Wpnet\ProPat\3423 00052MFE\Amendment After Final 4-03-2003

FAX RECEIVED
APR 07 2003
GROUP 1700

Version With Markings To Show Changes Made

Please amend claim 1 as follows:

1. (Twice amended) A white film having a thickness of from 10 to 500 μm , comprising a crystallizable polyolefin-free thermoplastic polyester polymer, at least one titanium dioxide of the rutile type that is oxidatively coated, and at least one optical brightener; wherein the titanium dioxide and the optical brightener are provided in the form of at least one masterbatch.

Please amend claim 15 as follows:

15. (Amended) The white film as claimed in claim 14 10, wherein the titanium dioxide and the optical brightener are additionally present in the outer layer(s).

Please add new claim 16 as follows:

16. The white film as claimed in claim 1, wherein said white film further comprises regrind.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY